

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-11, 15, and 17 are amended.

Support for the amendments to Claims 1-11, 15, and 17 is provided by the specification as originally filed, for example, formula 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b etc., Example III, and the originally filed claims.

No new matter has been added by the present amendments.

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over GB 1523076 is respectfully traversed.

The polymers described in the present application are high molecular weight grafted rubber polymers having viscosity in the range of 35-43 (see paragraph [0057] of the present application). In the GB 1523076, the cardanol/phosphorylated cardanol are physically added to natural rubber as a plasticizer, the vulcanization of the rubber was carried out by conventional means. There was no chemical grafting of the cardanol.

In the present invention, chemical grafting of the cardanol and phosphorylated cardanol onto the rubber backbone eliminated the problems of processing and difficulties during vulcanization. Therefore, claims of the present application are novel and inventive in view of GB 1523076.

Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

The rejection of Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is obviated in part by amendment and respectfully traversed in part.

At the outset, Applicants submit that criticisms (b) – (k) have been addressed by appropriate amendment.

With respect to criticism (a), MPEP §2173.01 states that Applicants “can define in the claims what they regard as their invention essentially in whatever terms they choose so long as the terms are not used in ways that are contrary to accepted meanings in the art.” Further, definiteness of claim language must be analyzed, not in a vacuum, but in light of:

(A) The content of the particular application disclosure;
(B) The teachings of the prior art; and
(C) The claim interpretation that would be given by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made (MPEP §2173.02).

The letter ‘n’ refers to number of repeat unit in a polymer which may be high or low depending upon the type of polymer, also known as degree of polymerization’. The ‘degree of polymerization’ can be calculated with the help of molecular weight of polymer, which can in turn be calculated from the viscosity. Thus, Applicants submit that the meaning of the term “n” in the claims would be apparent to the skilled artisan.

Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Finally, the objection to the claims is obviated by amendment. The claims have been amended herein to specifically address the Examiner’s criticisms. Thus, this objection is believed to be moot. Acknowledgement that this objection has been withdrawn is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)